

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 29, 2004. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-27 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-27 were rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23, and 25-27 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,721,815 issued to Brian A. Leete ("Leete"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23, and 25-27 are patentable over Leete.

Leete discloses that a "device is presented including a host controller to generate a transaction schedule." (Abstract)

Applicants Claim 1 calls for various features including, among others, a "configuring at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller, wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is configurable to be processed once every polling period."

Applicants Claim 10 calls for various elements including, among others, a program enabled to "store at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller in the memory, wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is configurable to be processed once every polling period."

Applicants Claim 19 calls for various elements including, among others, "storing at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller in a memory, wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is configurable to be processed once every polling period."

Leete cannot anticipate Applicants' Claim 1, 10 or 19, because Leete does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the elements recited by Claims 1, 10 or 19. For example, Leete fails to teach, disclose or suggest "configuring at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller, wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is *configurable to be processed once every polling period*," as recited by Claim 1. (emphasis

Claims 5, 6, 15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leete in view of U.S. Patent 6,272,499 issued to David R. Wooten ("Wooten"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Claims 5, 6, 15 and 24 are patentable over Leete in view of Wooten.

Claims 5 and 6, directly or indirectly, depend from and provide further patentable limitations to amended Claim 1. Claim 15, directly or indirectly, depends from and provides further patentable limitations to amended Claim 10. Claim 24, directly or indirectly, depends from and provides further patentable limitations to amended Claim 19. Because Claims 1, 10 and 19 are deemed allowable, Claims 5, 6, 15 and 24 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow Claims 5, 15 and 24.

added) Additionally, Leete fails to teach, disclose or suggest a program enabled to "store at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller in the memory, wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is *configurable to be processed once every polling period*," as recited by Claim 10. (emphasis added) Further, Leete fails to teach, disclose or suggest "storing at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller in a memory, wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is *configurable to be processed once every polling period*," as recited by Claim 19. (emphasis added)

The Examiner has stated that "Leete discloses a method of scheduling USB transaction processing tasks" by "configuring at least one periodic queue head list associated with a USB host controller ..., wherein each of the at least one periodic queue head lists is configurable to be processed once every polling period." Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact, the Examiner has illustrated (Figure 4) that "[i]nterrupt transfers and isochronous streams, with periods other than one, are linked following the period-one iTD/siTDs.... and the [l]onger poll rates are linked first..., followed by shorter poll rates, with queue head with a poll rate of one (1), on the very end." (Col. 3, lines 3-10)

Because Leete fails to teach, disclose or suggest all of the elements of Applicants' Claims 1, 10 or 19, Applicants respectfully assert that Leete does not anticipate Claims 1, 10 or 19. Therefore, Applicants traverse and submit that Claims 1, 10 and 19 are patentable over Leete.

Claims 2-5 and 7-9, directly or indirectly, depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 1. Claims 11-14 and 16-18, directly or indirectly, depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 10. Claims 20-23 and 25-27, directly or indirectly, depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 10. Because Claims 1 and 17 are deemed allowable, Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 25-27 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23, and 25-27.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 6, 15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leete in view of U.S. Patent 6,272,499 issued to David R. Wooten ("Wooten"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that Claims 5, 6, 15 and 24 are patentable over Leete in view of Wooten.

Claims 5 and 6, directly or indirectly, depend from and provide further patentable limitations to amended Claim 1. Claim 15, directly or indirectly, depends from and provides further patentable limitations to amended Claim 10. Claim 24, directly or indirectly, depends from and provides further patentable limitations to amended Claim 19. Because Claims 1, 10 and 19 are deemed allowable, Claims 5, 6, 15 and 24 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow Claims 5, 15 and 24.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1-27.

Applicants believe there are no fees due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2690.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Patrick J. Porter
Reg. No. 45,658

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
Baker Botts L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. 23640
512.322.2690
512.322.8385 (fax)

Date: July 29, 2004